

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 KIRK D. WILLIAMS,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 MCDONALD'S CORPORATION,

15 Defendant.  
16

No. 2:20-cv-1214 TLN DB PS

ORDER

17 Plaintiff Kirk Williams is proceeding in this action pro se. This matter was referred to the  
18 undersigned in accordance with Local Rule 302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). On April 6,  
19 2021, defendant noticed a motion to dismiss plaintiff's complaint. (ECF No. 12.) On April 15,  
20 2021, plaintiff filed a motion for an extension of time to file an opposition to defendant's motion  
21 to dismiss and to prepare a motion for leave to file an amended complaint. (ECF No. 13.) On  
22 April 26, 2021, the undersigned issued an order continuing the hearing of defendant's motion to  
23 dismiss to August 6, 2021, and granting plaintiff until June 4, 2021 to file an amended complaint.  
24 (ECF No. 14.)

25 On April 26, 2021, plaintiff filed a motion seeking "ADA accommodation," and noticed  
26 the motion for hearing before the undersigned on May 24, 2021. (ECF No. 15.) Plaintiff's  
27 motion seeks several accommodations including "[a]ccess to Lexis Nexis," "[a]ppointment of a  
28 reader named Terresa Robson," and "an order directed to the Defendant to provide . . . an audio

1 copy on CD” of any correspondence. (Id. at 3.) Defendant filed an opposition on May 6, 2021.<sup>1</sup>  
2 (ECF No. 17.)

3 Plaintiff is advised that “[t]he plain language of Title II the ADA excludes the federal  
4 government from the reach of the [ADA].” United States v. Hiranek, Case No. 6:16-po-0345  
5 MJS, 2017 WL 1349580, at \*5 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2017) (citing 42 U.S.C. § 12131(1)); see also  
6 Mary Jo. C. v. N.Y. State & Local Ret. Sys., 707 F.3d 144, 170 n.11 (2d Cir. 2013) (“Title II of  
7 the ADA is not applicable to the federal government[.]” (citation and internal quotation marks  
8 omitted)); Henrickson v. Potter, 327 F.3d 444, 447 (5th Cir. 2003) (“the entire federal  
9 government is excluded from the coverage of the ADA.”).

10 However, “[i]n keeping with the Judicial Conference Policy, the U.S. District Court –  
11 Eastern District of California provides reasonable accommodations to persons with  
12 communications disabilities at the court’s expense.”  
13 [http://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/attorney-info/accommodations-for-](http://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/attorney-info/accommodations-for-communication-disabilities/)  
14 [communication-disabilities/](http://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/attorney-info/accommodations-for-communication-disabilities/). Specifically, the “court must provide sign language interpreters or  
15 other auxiliary aids and services to participants in federal court proceedings who are deaf,  
16 hearing-impaired or have communication disabilities[.]” § 255.10(a).

17 At this time, however, there are no pending proceedings or hearings. Instead, the court is  
18 awaiting plaintiff’s election to either file an amended complaint or proceed on the original  
19 complaint in the face of defendant’s motion to dismiss. (ECF Nos. 10 & 14.) Defendant’s  
20 motion to dismiss asserts that the original complaint was “copied verbatim from a complaint filed  
21 in the Southern District of New York against the Amazon.com website.” (Def.’s MTD (ECF No.  
22 10-1) at 9.) Moreover, it appears from the court’s research that plaintiff “has filed numerous  
23 pleadings in both federal and state court” without the assistance of any court ordered  
24 accommodations. Williams v. Dickinson, No. CIV-S-09-2968 JAM CKD P, 2011 WL 4500807,  
25 at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2011).

26 ///

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>1</sup> The undersigned finds plaintiff’s motion suitable for resolution without a hearing pursuant to  
Local Rule 230(g).

1 For the reasons stated above, plaintiff's motion will be denied without prejudice to  
2 renewal should a hearing in this action be necessary or the matter proceed past the pleading stage.

3 **CONCLUSION**

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

5 1. The May 21, 2021 hearing of plaintiff's motion for ADA accommodations (ECF No.  
6 15) is vacated; and

7 2. Plaintiff's April 26, 2021 motion for ADA accommodations (ECF No. 15) is denied  
8 without prejudice to renewal.

9 Dated: May 17, 2021

10   
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 DEBORAH BARNES  
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 DLB:6  
24 DB/orders/orders.pro se/williams1214.ada.ord  
25  
26  
27  
28